

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Application No.: 09/938,944

Filed: August 24, 2001

Inventor(s):  
Tran

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD  
FOR CONTROLLING  
UNIX GROUP ACCESS  
USING LDAP

§  
§ Examiner: Shaw, Peling A.  
§ Group/Art Unit: 2144  
§ Atty. Dkt. No: 5181-82200  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

\*\*\*\*CERTIFICATE OF E-FILING TRANSMISSION\*\*\*\*

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being  
transmitted via electronic filing to the United States  
Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below

B. Noël Kivlin

  
13

Signature

August 8, 2007

Date

---

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

**Mail Stop AF**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated below.

Applicant is in receipt of the Advisory Action mailed July 23, 2007. Claims 1 – 25 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the present case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks. Please note that for brevity, only the primary arguments directed to the independent claims are presented, and that additional arguments, e.g., directed to the subject matter of the dependent claims, will be presented if and when the case proceeds to Appeal.

Claims 1 – 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Shandony (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,261) in view of Mangat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,799), hereinafter “Mangat.” The following clear errors in the Examiner’s rejection are noted.

Regarding claim 1, Shandony and Mangat, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest that a first group access control list (comprising the user IDs of users whose entries comprise the first group name) is stored outside of the directory, in combination with the remaining features of claim 1.

The Final Office Action contends that Mangat teaches or suggests these features (in particular, at Figures 4 and 5; col. 2, lines 14-28; col. 12, lines 23-33; and col. 16, lines 13-21). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Mangat discloses a method and apparatus for maintaining, updating, finding, and re-making links between documents and consumers of those documents. Mangat also discloses a data structure created and maintained outside a directory services system for storing information about the documents. However, Mangat does not teach or suggest an access control list stored outside of the directory. To the contrary, Mangat teaches away from Applicant’s claimed invention by disclosing that its group object (120), membership list (124), association lists (118, 136), and access rights (116, 122, 134) are stored within the directory services server (60) (see, e.g., Figures 2-5). Therefore, Mangat does not teach or suggest the feature “wherein the first group access control list is stored outside of the directory,” in combination with the remaining features of claim 1. Shandony also fails to teach or suggest the feature “wherein the first group access control list is stored outside of the directory,” in combination with the remaining features of claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Shandony and Mangat, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features recited in claim 3. Shandony discloses a policy URL (Uniform Resource Locator) obtained from a directory entry (see, e.g., Figure 69 and col. 70, line 60 to col. 71, line 47), and a URL may include a

hostname. However, Shandony does not teach or suggest “for each data source in the multi-user computing environment which permits access by the first hostname, granting access to the data source to the one or more users whose directory entries comprise the first hostname and who are seeking access from the host having the first hostname” (emphasis added) in combination with the remaining features of claims 1 and 3. Similar remarks apply to claims 12 and 19.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 17 are patentably distinct from the cited references. Thus for at least the foregoing reasons, the rejections of the independent claims are unsupported by the cited references, as are the rejections of those claims depending from the independent claims.

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such an extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5181-82200/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



---

B. Noël Kivlin  
Reg. No. 33,929  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, Texas 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8840  
Date: August 8, 2007